OFFICE OF THE D/I   *5 March*

Date: 11 Feb 75

TO: Messrs. Proctor/Walsh

25X1   FROM: ⬛⬛

SUBJECT: MAGID Matters

file attachments MAGID (if not already there)

I am attaching two reports by MAGID: one
on your State of the Directorate speech, and
another on improving the quality of supervision.
25X1   (Copies also sent to ⬛⬛)

When you have had a chance to read them,
MAGID would like to schedule a luncheon to dis-**
cuss those and other matters. — *OK - arrange*

STAT   ⬛⬛ tells me the group will be
seeing the DCI (this evening, I believe) for the
general chat they mentioned earlier. He would
like, if possible, to schedule the luncheon for
next week. (That being a short week, however,
we might have to pick a later date.)

** I subsequently learned it:
tomorrow night evening (5:30)*

** Set up for 5 March

MAGID-12

7 February 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT   :   Evaluation of Quality in Supervision

     MAGID has argued in earlier studies for improving unsatisfactory
supervision through training, as well as policies of openness and
fairness to employees by management. MAGID also feels that further
improvement could be realized in the DDI and the Agency as a whole if
there were regular and formalized means of evaluating the quality of
first-line supervision.

     MAGID supports the several informal means which have already
been employed in the Directorate. FBIS, OSR, IAS, CRS and OER have
held meetings of supervisors, analysts, and clericals [   ]   **STAT**
[   ] to informally and openly discuss complaints and
satisfactions. OGCR, OPR and IAS either have or are considering
setting up representative organizations along the lines of MAGID to
increase communications within their offices.

     MAGID feels, however, that a more rigorous, formalized approach
is also needed. While informal mechanisms are valuable for outlining
broad problem areas and, indeed, give both supervisors and their
employees a greater understanding of each other's difficulties, they
rarely identify a specific supervisory failure or, for that matter,
an outstanding success.

     MAGID has discussed -- and rejected as unworkable -- methods
based on "reverse" fitness reports to be written by employees on
their supervisors, similar to those many universities use to rate
teachers. If done anonymously, evaluations of this sort run counter
to the openness and directness we are trying to promote within the
agency; but if not done anonymously, we feel few employees would
give honest answers out of fear of retaliation or to avoid the
appearance of currying favor.

     Instead, MAGID favors DDI-wide adoption of the method of
employee surveys used by OER. The OER survey was designed specif-
ically to evaluate first line supervisors after an analysts' conference
[   ] suggested many problem areas needing treatment. The
survey was designed along with OMS and administered by them to
eliminate possible biases if given solely by OER. It asked some 75

STAT (left margin, upper)

STAT (left margin, lower)

questions on supervision, communications, personnel matters, job content, and office morale. Statistical data were tabulated and first-line supervisors were given results showing how he or she compared with the OER average in specific categories.

The survey had much merit as a management tool that suggests it be tried on a DDI-wide basis. Most importantly, the results put the lie to some misconceptions the office director had, identified some previously unknown problems, and enabled him to treat them on an individual basis. It took little time or money. OMS -- at the time -- had excess capacity to use to plan and administer the survey; it took relatively little of the respondent's time to answer. It was taken seriously by analysts, and the response rate was high - 95%.

The survey method does have some shortcomings. It would have to be individually tailored to offices considering size, mission, and homogeniety of components. Since it need be given only once every three years, however, the cost shouldn't be great and offices could be staggered over the period. There were some understandable problems in getting supervisors to go along with it, not only because poor supervisors feared what it might reveal but also because many objected to the principle of their roles being subject to judgment from below.

The primary limitation of the survey -- as well as of any management tool -- is the use to which the office director puts it. There must be some followup specifically designed to correct the difficulties pinpointed by the survey, such as telling the supervisor that he or she is going to be judged in the next fitness report on how well improvements are made, and by recommending corrective action -- additional training, for example -- that should be taken.

MAGID believes that a total package approach -- one that fosters the informal, employee-management communications currently used, but combines them with supervisor evaluation through OER's survey method and with a training program that begins early in a career and that contains remediation as required -- is the best approach to both improve the quality of supervision and identify those doing it right.

Attachment: OER Analyst Survey

-2-